



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,849	01/13/2004	Jeffrey Gabbay	082871-000520US	3395

20350 7590 12/27/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

BOGART, MICHAEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3761

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/27/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/756,849

Applicant(s)

GABBAY, JEFFREY

Examiner

Michael G. Bogart

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg (US 5,856,248 A) in view of Gabbay (US 6,124,221 A; hereinafter '221), Gabbay (WO 01/81671 A2; hereinafter '671) and Gabbay (WO 01/74166 A1; hereinafter '166).

Regarding claims 1, 5 and 7, Weinberg teaches a disposable feminine hygiene paper-based product capable of combating yeast infections, comprising a portion formed from paper mulch said portion comprising a plurality of fibers coated with an anti-biotic, water soluble, form of copper bound to the fibers, which fibers have been added to said paper mulch and which fibers release cupric ions in cationic form when in contact with a fluid, wherein said disposable feminine hygiene paper-based product is selected from the group consisting of sanitary napkins, sanitary pads, panty shields and tampons (abstract; col. 3, lines 5-54; example 10).

Weinberg does not disclose expressly a water insoluble, dark brown form of copper oxide directly bonded to the fibers.

'221 teaches an article of clothing including undergarment crotch pads made of natural fibers having a plating that releases an anti-yeast effective amount of at least one oxidant cationic

species of copper (abstract, col. 2, lines 15-25, col. 3, line 61-col. 4, line 4, claim 6). '221 further discloses that the plating involves direct bonding of metals or metal oxides to the fibers (col. 2, lines 5-54). '221 does not expressly disclose which specific oxidant cationic species of copper is released, but CuO is referred to in the background.

'671 teaches similar fabrics to those of '221, which involves plating of metal or metal oxides to a natural fiber textile fabric. Specifically, '671 teaches that the ionic form of copper directly bonded to the fibers may include cupric oxide (CuO) or cuprous oxide (Cu₂O)(page 6, lines 24-29). Cupric oxide and cuprous oxide are inherently water insoluble (see definition of cuprous oxide and cupric oxide, Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary).

'166 teaches antimicrobial textiles that have a water insoluble mixture of cupric oxide (CuO) and cuprous oxide (Cu₂O) powder (abstract; page 4, lines 14-24; examples 1 and 2; claim 9). Cupric oxide is black in color while cuprous oxide is red. A mixture of cupric oxide and cuprous oxide is dark brown in appearance (see paragraph 4 of applicant's declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, dated 05 March 2007).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the soluble salts of Weinberg with the directly plated cationic copper methods of '221, '671 and the specific cationic species mixture of '166 in order to provide an art recognized effective antimicrobial compound that avoids the problems associated with indirect bonding via carriers or adhesives (see '671, page 1, last paragraph).

Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007)(citing *KSR v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Applicant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent persuasive evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007)(citing *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396). Accordingly, since the applicant[s] have submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because it is no more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions resulting in the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement.

The limitations concerning how the paper-based product is made from mulch and how the fibers are finely chopped before addition to the mulch are product-by-process limitations. Product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps. MPEP § 2113. The determination of patentability in a product-by-process claim is based on the product itself, even though the claim may be limited and defined by the process. That is, the product in such a claim is unpatentable if it is the same as or obvious from the product of the prior art, even if the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A product-by-process limitation adds no patentable distinction to the claim, and is unpatentable if the claimed

product is the same as a product of the prior art. Weinberg teaches cellulosic fibers which are substantially the same as those made according to the claims (col. 3, line 2).

Regarding claims 2 and 6, Weinberg teaches cellulosic fibers (col. 3, line 2).

Regarding claim 3, see Weinberg, col. 2, line 49-col. 3, line 62.

Regarding claim 4, '221 teaches a skin contactable garment liner comprising an anti yeast infection liner (col. 30, lines 51-53).

Response to Arguments

The rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 USC § 112 first paragraph is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 02 October 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-7 under Weinberg (US 5,856,248) in view of Gabbay (CA 2 404 972) and Gabbay (US 6,124,221) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Weinberg in view of '221, '671 and '166.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Bogart whose telephone number is (571) 272-4933.

In the event the examiner is not available, the Examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva may be reached at phone number (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for formal communications. For informal communications, the direct fax to the Examiner is (571) 273-4933.

Application/Control Number:
10/756,849
Art Unit: 3761

Page 6

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Michael Bogart
19 December 2007

TATYANA ZALUKAEVA
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER

